

10-24-1983

## University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, October 24, 1983

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

*Let us know how access to this document benefits you*

Copyright ©1983 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: [https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate\\_documents](https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents)



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, October 24, 1983" (1983). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 443.

[https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate\\_documents/443](https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/443)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Documents - Faculty Senate by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact [scholarworks@uni.edu](mailto:scholarworks@uni.edu).

Senate Minutes  
October 24, 1983  
1322

NOV 1 1983

OFFICE OF DEAN  
COLLEGE OF NAT. SCIENCES

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Correction of Senate meeting dates. Announcement in Green Sheet is in error.
2. Letter from Donald Wright, Chair of the Ethnic Minorities Cultural and Educational Center Policy Board.
3. Faculty Chair announces no faculty meeting on November 7.
4. Correction on Minutes 1321 dated October 10, 1983, page 2, item 1. Change a report to the Academic Master Plan Committee to a report from the Academic Master Plan Committee.
5. Comments from Vice President and Provost Martin.

CALENDAR

6. 354 A proposal from the Committee on Curricula regarding regression and duplication of courses (see letter and attachment from Dr. Fred W. Lott, Chair of the Committee on Curricula, dated October 20, 1983) (see Appendix A). Docketed in regular order. Docket 295.

NEW/OLD BUSINESS

7. Request to the Committee on Committees to submit a list of names to the Senate for the establishment of a committee to make recommendations regarding instructional needs at UNI.
8. Request to the Committee on Committees to submit a list of names to the Senate for the establishment of a committee to make recommendations concerning the UNI Athletic Policy Board.
9. Adopted the Chair's proposal for alteration in Senate procedures to handle applications for emeritus faculty status (see Appendix B).
10. Announced the committee to handle appeals from the faculty chair's ruling regarding faculty status. The Chair is Senate Vice Chair Fred Hallberg and committee members are Senators Kelly and Richter.

DOCKET

11. 353 294 Return to the petitioner the report of the University Committee on Curricula on portfolio assessment with a request for further clarification on language.
12. 351 292 Postponed action on the Academic Master Plan Committee Report until January 23, 1984 (see Appendix C, letter from Professor Darrel Davis).



The University Faculty Senate was called to order at 4:00 p.m., October 24, 1983, in the Board Room by Chairperson Remington.

Present: Baum, Boots, Dowell, Erickson, Evenson, Glenn, Goulet, Heller, Kelly, Krogmann, Patton, Peterson, Remington, Richter, Sandstrom, Story, Hovet (ex officio).

Alternates: Tarr for Duea, Shontz for Elmer, Amend for Hallberg.

Members of the press were requested to identify themselves. Sandy Hemmer of the Northern Iowan, Laura Amick of Public Information and Karla Berger of the Waterloo Courier were in attendance.

#### ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. The Chair announced a correction of the Senate meeting dates that were listed in the Green Sheet. The meetings in November will be November 14 at 3:15 p.m. and November 28 at 4:00 p.m.
  2. The Chair announced that he had received a letter from Don Wright, the Chairman of the Ethnic Minorities Cultural and Educational Center Policy Board, thanking him and the Senate for appointing Rhoda Brooks as a member of the Board. Mr. Wright also asked the Chair to announce to the Senate that the Policy Board is interested in keeping communications open to all areas of the university and to encourage the Senators and faculty to make their views known to the committee.
  3. The Faculty Chair announced, because of the lack of business, there will be no faculty meeting on November 7, 1983.
  4. Senator Dowell asked for a correction to Senate Minutes 1321 dated October 10, 1983. On page 2, the first item--A report to the Academic Master Plan Committee should be changed to A report from the Academic Master Plan Committee.
  5. Dr. Martin reported a workshop "Writing Across the Curriculum" was being sponsored by the university on October 24 and 25. He also said the Board of Regents approved the post-audit report on the Doctorate of Industrial Technology.
- He announced Dr. Fred Lott would be retiring at the end of the year and praised Dr. Lott for serving the university with distinction and devotion since 1949.

#### CALENDAR

6. 354 A proposal from the Committee on Curricula regarding regression and duplication of courses in academic programs (see letter and attachment from Dr. Fred W. Lott, Chair of the Committee on Curricula, dated October 20, 1983) (see Appendix A).

Goulet/Boots moved to docket in regular order. Motion passed. Docket 295.

#### NEW/OLD BUSINESS

7. Senator Richter said he had sent a questionnaire to the faculty of the College of Natural Sciences regarding the instructional needs at UNI. He received a 70% response. Fifty-one percent said they would not use an instructional center and 8% said they would. He wondered if appointing the committee was necessary.



The Chair pointed out that the Senate had already voted to establish the committee. The committee may find out that the needs are already being met but that is something they will have to investigate.

Sandstrom said the point is to assess the resources and future needs not specifically to a new center.

Richter said he would give the information on the questionnaire he had done to the committee.

Boots/Sandstrom moved that the Committee on Committees be requested to provide the Senate with a list of ten candidates, two from each college or school, from which five members would be selected by the Senate for the ad hoc committee to obtain information on the various types of instructional and faculty resources and needs which currently exist at UNI. A paper ballot election would be conducted by the Senate following a brief explanation of the criteria for selection which was used by the Committee on Committees. The term of appointment to the committee will be determined by the length of time it takes the committee to do its work.

Dowell offered the friendly amendment that one member would be from each college.

The amendment was seconded by Boots and Sandstrom.

Krogmann asked if the Senate should give guidelines to the Committee on Committees or should the Senate assume that Tarr and the Chair will pass along a Senate feeling.

Goulet said that if the intent is to help the faculty to develop themselves, information on research resources should be included.

Sandstrom said he was in sympathy with the concept but it would add to the burden of the committee and possibly delay the report. Possibly faculty research resources could be considered in the near future.

The Chair asked if a time for the Committee on Committees to report back should be included.

Boots/Sandstrom agreed to accept as a friendly amendment to their motion that the Committee on Committees should report back by November 28.

The vote was taken. The motion passed.

8. Sandstrom/Evenson moved that the Committee on Committees be requested to provide the Senate with a list of ten candidates, two from each college or school, from which five members would be selected by the Senate, one from each college, for the ad hoc committee to make recommendations to the Senate concerning the UNI Athletic Policy Board. A paper ballot election will be conducted by the Senate following a brief explanation of the criteria for selection which was used by the Committee on Committees. The term of appointment to the committee will be determined by the length of time it takes the committee to do its work. The Committee on Committees should report back to the Senate by November 28.

Peterson said his constituency would like to be included and wondered if possibly other groups would like to be included on this committee also.



Boots/Story moved to amend the motion to stipulate that the Committee on Committees be requested to provide the Senate with a list of ten candidates, from faculty or P&S staff, from which five members would be selected by the Senate for the ad hoc committee to make recommendations concerning the UNI Athletic Policy Board.

The vote was taken. The amendment passed.

Erickson asked if the main motion included the time of November 28.

The Chair said it did.

Vote was taken. The main motion passed.

9. Evenson/Erickson moved to adopt the Chair's proposal for alteration in Senate procedures to handle applications for emeritus faculty status.

The proposal is "The Senate has approved certain minimal criteria for awarding emeritus status to retiring UNI faculty members; at present, these criteria focus on length of service as a faculty member at UNI or at other educational institutions. These criteria, of course, are in the Senate's authority to set or to change as it sees fit. I think, though, that the Senate would be wise to take the position that any faculty member who has demonstrably fulfilled its criteria is entitled to the rank of professor emeritus. Since the criteria presently approved by the Senate concern only the easily documentable matter of length of service, there seems little reason for this Senate to consider these applications substantively.

"Thus, I would suggest that with future applications for emeritus status, the Senate simply authorize the Senate Chair to sign the appropriate documents as an indication of the Senate's approval of the application. By the time these applications reach the Senate, they have already been acted upon at the departmental and collegiate levels; if anyone at either of those levels wishes to oppose the granting of emeritus status, that person would have ample time to inform the Senate Chair of such opposition before the Chair indicates Senate approval of the application. Should opposition come forward, the Senate could then consider the matter substantively.

"However, it should be clearly understood that the only argument against emeritus status which the Senate would consider appropriate would be a denial of the applicant's meeting the minimal criteria stipulated by the Senate. There can be, I contend, no other legitimate grounds for denial of emeritus status."

Kelly asked if the names approved would be announced by the Chair.

The Chair said they would be announced and published in the Senate minutes.

Tarr said he preferred handling emeritus applications formally, according to the existing procedures. If there were possible objections, how would people let the Senate know.

Krogmann asked if anyone had ever been turned down.

Dr. Martin said no.

Professor Davis said the proposed procedure was not in keeping with the spirit of giving the title of professor emeritus. Handling it in this matter gives no one the opportunity to express opposition.



After more general discussion, the call for the vote was made. Motion passed.

10. The Chair announced that Senator Hallberg had informed him that Senators Kelly and Richter had agreed to serve with Hallberg on the Senate committee to handle appeals from the faculty chair's rulings regarding faculty status. The Chair said he had turned over materials regarding such appeals to the committee chair, Senator Hallberg.

#### DOCKET

11. 353 294 The Report of the University Committee on Curricula and Portfolio Assessment.

The Chair asked Dr. Lott if he cared to speak to the report.

Dr. Lott said that the Committee on Curricula recommendation was very similar to the report of the Experiential Learning Committee. He asked that the report be accepted.

Baum/Boots moved to approve the report.

Goulet asked the effect of the Senate's approval of the report.

The Chair said that the report would then become university policy.

Goulet asked if open credit was different from the report's proposal.

Lott said the main modification was to add "portfolio" to "open credit" and to get the statement in the catalog.

Evenson asked if the credit was to be given for work to be done rather than for work already completed.

Professor Talbott said the credit was given for a written report of the project but also included a validation of that project.

Goulet asked if we are offering this kind of credit, what criteria would determine what would be acceptable and what would not be acceptable?

Lott said that such projects were evaluated by faculty and that the integrity of the program is determined by the integrity of the faculty.

Evenson said he understood the difficulty of stating the intent in precise language, but noted that the statement led him to think that a project had to be completed after enrollment.

Heller said the Senate was spending its time editing a recommendation and it was creating new problems. He said he had spent three hours at a workshop last spring on experiential learning and that what he had learned cannot be put in one paragraph in a catalog statement.

Kelly/Goulet moved to return the report to the petitioners with a request for further clarification on language.

Motion passed.

12. 351 292 The Report of the Academic Master Plan Committee (a letter on this subject was received by the Chair from Professor Darrel Davis and is attached as Appendix C).

The Chair asked Dr. Martin if he cared to speak about the report.

Dr. Martin said he appreciated the distribution of the report by including it with the Faculty Senate minutes. He said the report requests that the university use its energies and make a special effort to enrich the undergraduate education in the arts and sciences.

Heller/Glenn moved to acknowledge receipt of the report.

Many of the Senators expressed approval of some aspects of the report and concerns with other areas.

Goulet suggested an amendment to accept the report but expressed concern with some of the content of the report.

Patton said the Senators owe it to their constituents to identify their concerns.

Heller/Goulet moved to postpone further consideration of the report to the January 23, 1984, meeting.

Motion passed.

Glenn/Tarr moved the Senate adjourn. Motion passed.

The Senate adjourned at 5:43 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Engen  
Secretary

These minutes shall stand approved as published unless corrections or protests are filed with the secretary of the Senate within two weeks of this date, Tuesday, November 1, 1983.



## APPENDIX A



University of Northern Iowa  
Office of Academic Affairs

Oedar Falls, Iowa 50614  
Telephone (319) 273-2517

October 20, 1983

Dr. Thomas Remington, Chair  
University Faculty Senate  
University of Northern Iowa

Dear Tom:

The University Committee on Curricula has for some time been studying policies on regression and on duplication of course work. The Committee is now ready to recommend:

1. that the attached policies be adopted by the University, and
2. that these statements appear in the General University Catalog.

A brief explanation of the reason for these policies may be helpful at this point.

Some departments offer a series of courses that are highly sequential in nature. The department may feel it inappropriate for a student to obtain credit in an elementary course of the sequence after the student has completed an advanced part of the sequence. The proposed regression policy outlines how such a situation would be handled on the student's records. Please note that it is the department that makes the decision on which courses, if any, would be considered regressive. If a department has no courses to designate regressive, this policy would not apply to any of its courses.

Duplication applies only to those courses whose catalog description includes a statement to the effect that a student who has credit in xx:xxx may not receive credit in this course. The proposed policy on duplication states how a student's record would appear if the student did take both such courses. If a department has no courses in which such a limitation appears, this policy would not apply to the courses of that department.

Departments and colleges have been informed of the proposed policies and were invited to attend a meeting of the University Committee on Curricula at which they were discussed.

Sincerely,

*Fred W. Lott*

Fred W. Lott, Chair  
University Committee on Curricula

j1  
Enc.  
cc: University Committee on Curricula



University of Northern Iowa  
Office of Academic Affairs

Oedar Falls, Iowa 50614  
Telephone (319) 273-2517

### REGRESSION

Regression occurs when a student enrolls in a course which has content fundamental to another course the student has previously completed successfully. When such regression occurs, the regressive course will be available on an ungraded (credit/no credit) basis only. Credit may be earned, but the hours earned will increase the student's minimum degree hour requirement by an equal amount.

The decision as to whether a course is regressive is made by the department offering the courses. Regression does not occur when the more advanced course was failed. Courses to which this policy applies will be identified in the Schedule of Classes.

### DUPLICATION

When two courses have content which is highly similar, e.g., one for general education and one for major/minor requirements, the department offering the course(s) will determine if degree credit can be earned in its course(s). If the department will not allow degree credit in both courses, the credit in the course taken second will increase the student's minimum degree hour requirement by an equal amount. Such second courses may be completed only on an ungraded (credit/no credit) basis.



## APPENDIX C



University of Northern Iowa  
School of Business

Cedar Falls, Iowa 50614  
Telephone (319) 273-2400

October 18, 1983

Professor Thomas Remington, Chairman  
University Faculty Senate  
Baker 224  
University of Northern Iowa

Dear Professor Remington:

The REPORT OF THE ACADEMIC MASTER PLAN COMMITTEE for 1983 has raised two concerns. One concern is that a good deal of the report appears to me to deal with topics inappropriate for inclusion in a master plan. The second concern is that in my opinion it would be contrary to the best interests of the students of the University to adopt some of the recommendations included in the report.

It appears to me that the University Faculty have a constant responsibility to administer the curriculum and follow hiring and staffing policies which will accomplish the objectives as stated in section 1, parts a. through d. It is unfortunate that we might have failed to do that, and I do not think it is appropriate to tell the world that we are going to do what we should have been doing anyway. If I were a member of the Board of Regents and received this report, I would be concerned about just what has been going on at UNI. I would assign items 6 and 7 in the report very low priority in light of other more critical needs.

Item 2 of the report appears to be a legitimate item for inclusion in that it addresses a proposed degree. The last sentence of item 2, however, should be dealt with under a separate rubric.

Item 1, part e. does not appear to be in the best interests of our students. Students should not be allowed to avoid courses in which the "style of instruction" differs from what they prefer. How can we possibly believe that students should not be exposed to group discussion experiences, case study experiences, essay examination experiences, oral presentation and examination experiences, and field research experiences just to name a few? I can not accept the premise that left to their own will students will choose what is in their own long-term best interests and have the maturity and experience to make such choices.

Part f. of item 1 seems strange. We appear to condone in light of another item in this report the existence of a general education program with so much latitude that it is necessary for faculty through advising to ensure students are graduated with a reasonable balance of general education courses. As a faculty advisor very few students seek my advice on the selection of gen-

Professor Thomas Remington, Chairman  
University Faculty Senate  
October 18, 1983  
Page 2

eral education classes. I am not aware that as an advisor I have the authority to "ensure" that students select what I would consider an appropriate program.

Item 1, part g. appears to me to be stated backward. It is our colleagues in the liberal arts who appropriately feel the need for students to take more liberal arts courses. Faculty in Business, Industrial Technology, Computer Science, and Music should support the liberal arts faculty by reducing major requirements to allow for more liberal arts courses in students' programs.

There is more that I could comment on, but time does not permit.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Darrel W. Davis".

Darrel W. Davis  
Associate Professor  
of Accounting